

Message Text

PAGE 01 SALT T 05324 052109Z

71

ACTION SS-25

INFO OCT-01 ISO-00 SSO-00 NSCE-00 CIAE-00 INRE-00 /026 W

----- 027730

O 052015Z OCT 73

FM USDEL SALT TWO GENEVA

TO SECSTATE WASHDC IMMEDIATE 2117

INFO DOD IMMEDIATE

S E C R E T SALT TWO GENEVA 5324

EXDIS/SALT

SPECAT EXCLUSIVE FOR SECDEF

E.O. 11652: XGDS 1

TAGS: PARM

SUBJ: SALT: HIGHLIGHTS OF OCT 5 POST-MEETING DISCUSSIONS

(SALT TWO - 297)

1. SUMMARY: POST-MEETING DISCUSSIONS FOCUSED ON OUTSTANDING
US AND SOVIET PROPOSALS, FUTURE AGREEMENTS, IA LIMITATIONS ON
ICBMS, AND FBS. END SUMMARY

2. OUTSTANDING US AND SOVIET PROPOSALS. SHCHUKIN (TO NITZE,
A-361) SAID THAT NITZE SHOULD HAVE NOTED CHANGE IN THE SOVIET POS-
TION ON THE RELATIONSHIP OF IA TERMS TO THOSE IN PERMANENT AGREE-
MENT: THE SOVIET SIDE WAS NOT NOW MAINTAINING THAT LIMITATIONS
ON ICBM AND SLBM LAUNCHERS AND SUBMARINES SHOULD BE THE SAME AS
THOSE IN IA JUST BECAUSE THEY WERE IN THE IA. INSTEAD, SOVIETS
BELIEVED THAT THERE WERE SOUND REASONS FOR INCLUSION OF SUCH
TERMS IN THE PERMANENT AGREEMENT, I.E., THERE SHOULD BE NO
BUILDUP IN NUMBERS OF ICBM AND SLBM LAUNCHERS AND SUBMARINES.
NITZE SAID THAT MORE LOGICAL POSITION WOULD BE FOR BOTH SIDES
TO ABIDE BY PRINCIPLES OF EQUAL SECURITY INTERESTS AND NO
UNILATERAL ADVANTAGE BY SETTING EQUAL LIMITS ON ICBM LAUNCHERS
AND ON ICBM LAUNCHER THROW-WEIGHT.

3. FUTURE AGREEMENTS. GRINEVSKY (TO KLOSSON, A-363) SAID THAT
BOTH SIDES AGREE THAT SCOPE OF A PERMANENT AGREEMENT WOULD
SECRET

PAGE 02 SALT T 05324 052109Z

INDEED BE LARGER THAN THAT OF IA AND THAT IN ACCORDANCE WITH
ART VII THE TERMS OF A PERMANENT AGREEMENT NEED NOT BE THE
SAME AS THOSE OF IA. WHILE AGREEING THAT THERE WAS NO JURI-
DICAL BASIS FOR CONTENDING THAT NUMERICAL LIMITATIONS OF IA

SHOULD BE CARRIED OVER TO PERMANENT AGREEMENT, HE ASSERTED THAT ART VII DOES NOT EXCLUDE POSSIBILITY THAT NUMERICAL LIMITATIONS ESTABLISHED IN IA COULD BE PRESERVED IN PERMANENT AGREEMENT.

4. BELETSKY (TO FITZGERALD, A-362) SAID THAT SOVIET OCT 2 STATEMENT WOULD PERMIT USSR TO HAVE 950 SLBM LAUNCHERS AND INDICATED THAT UNDER THEIR PROPOSAL SOVIETS WOULD STILL HAVE TO DISMANTLE OLDER LAUNCHERS TO REACH 950 LEVEL. BELETSKY REFUSED TO RESPOND DIRECTLY TO QUESTION WHETHER PROPOSAL WOULD GIVE US 710 SLBM LAUNCHERS, AND INSTEAD REFERRED FITZGERALD TO OCT 2 PROPOSAL WHICH WAS CAST IN TERMS OF "PRESENT LEVEL". 5. TRUSOV (TO ROWNY, A-364) SAID THAT WEAPONS OTHER THAN THOSE ADDRESSED IN IA MUST BE LIMITED IN A PERMANENT AGREEMENT. AS FOR CARRYING OVER NUMBERS OF ICBM AND SLBM LAUNCHERS AND SUBMARINES FROM IA INTO PERMANENT AGREEMENT, TRUSOV SAID NUMBERS WOULD BE CARRIED OVER NOT BECAUSE OF ART VII BUT ON THEIR OWN MERITS. THEREFORE, HE FAILED TO UNDERSTAND REPEATED US REFERENCE TO ART VII. ROWNY SAID THAT IT NOW APPEARED THAT BOTH SIDES UNDERSTOOD ONE ANOTHER, I.E., NOTHING IN IA COULD PREJUDICE THE SCOPE AND TERMS OF LIMITATIONS OF ANY PART OF A PERMANENT AGREEMENT. TRUSOV DID NOT DISAGREE.

6. IN RESPONSE TO GRAYBEAL'S QUESTION WHETHER LAST PARA OF OCT 5 SOVIET STATEMENT INDICATED (A-360) POSSIBLE SOVIET WILLINGNESS TO CONSIDER SEPARATE MEASURES IN ADDITION TO IA AND

WHETHER THEY HAD SPECIFIC SEPARABLE MEASURE IN MIND, SMOLIN SAID SOVIET SIDE HAD SUGGESTED SEPARABLE MEASURES DURING LAST SESSION OF SALT AND WAS WILLING TO CONSIDER ANY ADDITIONAL PROPOSALS THE US MIGHT WISH TO MAKE. GRAYBEAL REPEATED HIS QUESTION RE A SEPARABLE MEASURE SOVIETS MIGHT POSSIBLY BE PLANNING TO PROPOSE, BUT SMOLIN SAID HE COULD SAY NO MORE AT THIS TIME.

7. IA LIHITA
TION TN IZMS. GRAYBEAL CALLED SMOLIN'S ATTENTION
SECRET

PAGE 03 SALT T 05324 052109Z

TO DIFFERENT WORDING BETWEEN ART I AND THE SOVIET OCT 22 STATEMENT. (ART I STATES THAT THE PARTIES UNDERTAKE NOT TO START CONSTRUCTION OF "ADDITIONAL" FIXED LAND-BASED ICBM LAUNCHERS AFTER JULY 21, 1972. THE SOVIET OCT 2 WORDING STATES THAT "THERE MUST BE NO BUILD-UP IN THE NUMBER OF FIXED LAND-BASED ICBM LAUNCHERS" IN ONE PLACE, AND IN ANOTHER THAT "A PERMANENT AGREEMENT MUST PROVIDE THAT BOTH SIDES ASSUME THE OBLIGATION TO LIMIT FIXED LAND-BASED INTERCONTINENTAL BALLISTIC MISSILE LAUNCHERS TO THE NUMBERS THEY PRESENTLY HAVE"). GRAYBEAL STATED THAT USE OF TERM "ADDITIONAL" IN ART I SUPPLEMENTED BY NEGOTIATING RECORD CLEARLY MEANT THAT NEITHER SIDE COULD

REPLACE FIXED ICBM LAUNCHERS. HOWEVER, SOVIET WORDING OF OCT 2 INDICATES A CEILING WITHIN WHICH EITHER SIDE COULD RE-

PLACE ICBM LAUNCHERS. SMOLIN ADCKNOWLEDGED THE DIFFERENCE IN WORDING BUT DID NOT ENDORSE THE DIFFERENCE IN INTERPRETATION. GRINEVSKY AND FITZGERALD THEN JOINED CONVERSATION, AND

GRINEVSKY CONFIRMED THE INTERPRETATION OF ART I BUT NEITHER ENDORSED GRAYBEAL'S INTERPRETATION OF THE OCT 2 WORDING NOR PROVIDED ANY ADDITIONAL CLARIFICATION. IN SEPARATE FITZGERALD-TRUSOV CONVERSATION, TRUSOV STATED THAT THE OCT 2 STATEMENT WAS NOT INTENDED TO ZEALY IHALE FROM ART I AND THAT

REPLACEMENT OF ICBM LAUNCHERS WOULD NOT BE PERMITTED UNDER SALT TWO(295).

8. TRUSOV (TO FITZGERALD, A-362) SAID THAT SOVIET OCT 2 STATEMENT ON LIMITING ICBMS TO CURRENT LEVELS MEANT THAT WORDING OF ART I OF IA WOULD NOT BE CARRIED OVER INTO PERMANENT AGREEMENT: THE PARTIES HAVE ASSUMED OBLIGATIONS UNDER ART I OF IA NOT TO BEGIN CONSTRUCTION OF NEW ICBM SITES BUT THEY DID NOT ADDRESS ICBM LEVELS. IN ADDITION, HE SAID, SOVIETS INTERPRET IA AS A PROHIBITION ON CONSTRUCTION OF NEW SITES AND RELOCATION OF SITES. SINCE PERMANENT AGREEMENT WILL

APPARENTLY BE SIGNED DURING LIFETIME OF IA, TRUSOV SAID THAT, DESPITE SOVIET OCT 2 FORMULATION, IT WOULD ALSO PROHIBIT CON-
SECRET

PAGE 04 SALT T 05324 052109Z

CONSTRUCTION OF NEW SITES AND PRECLUDE SITE RELOCATION, SINCE BOTH SIDES HAVE IMPLEMENTED IA AND THERE HAVE BEEN NO INSTANCES OF NON-COMPLIANCE WITH OBLIGATIONS NOT TO BUILD NEW SITES.

9. FBS. BELETSKY (TO FITZGERALD, A-362) SAID THAT OCT 5 SOVIET STATEMENT SHOULD MAKE CLEAR THAT SEMENOV'S SEPT 28 STATEMENT RE "PRESENCE AND BUILD-UP OF NUCLEAR WEAPONS IN THIRD COUNTRIES THEMSELVES BUT TO NUCLEAR WARHEADS HELD BY "COUNTRY A" IN THIRD COUNTRIES.

10. DURING CONVERSATION WITH SHCHUKIN (A-361), NITZE NOTED THAT SEMENOV'S STATEMENT TODAY FAILED TO MENTION ART XII OF 1972 BASIC PRINCIPLES. IN RESPONSE, SHCHUKIN SAID THAT THEIR INSTRUCTIONS WERE FULL OF GUIDANCE FROM HIGHER LEVELS WHICH MADE IT MANDATORY FOR THEM TO TAKE THE POSITION THEY HAD ON FORWARD BASED SYSTEMS. HE SAID THIS WAS A POLITICAL MATTER, INFERRING THAT IT WAS NOT ONE WHICH HE COULD DISCUSS ON OBJECTIVE BASIS.

1. GRINEVSKY (TO KLOSSON, A-363) SAID THAT ONCE US UNDERTAKES TO DISCUSS QUESTION OF FBS, IT WOULD THEN BE MUCH EASIER FOR SOVIETS TO ADDRESS THEMSELVES TO THE QUESTION OF THE TOTAL. JOHNSON

NOTE BY OC/T: MESSAGE RECEIVED GARBLED AND HAS BEEN EDITED.
VERIFICATION AND CORRECTIONS TO FOLLOW.

SECRET

<< END OF DOCUMENT >>

Message Attributes

Automatic Decaptioning: X
Capture Date: 11 MAY 1999
Channel Indicators: n/a
Current Classification: UNCLASSIFIED
Concepts: n/a
Control Number: n/a
Copy: SINGLE
Draft Date: 05 OCT 1973
Decaption Date: 01 JAN 1960
Decaption Note:
Disposition Action: RELEASED
Disposition Approved on Date:
Disposition Authority: golinofr
Disposition Case Number: n/a
Disposition Comment: 25 YEAR REVIEW
Disposition Date: 28 MAY 2004
Disposition Event:
Disposition History: n/a
Disposition Reason:
Disposition Remarks:
Document Number: 1973SALTT05324
Document Source: ADS
Document Unique ID: 00
Drafter: n/a
Enclosure: n/a
Executive Order: 11652 XGDS 1
Errors: n/a
Film Number: n/a
From: SALT TWO GENEVA
Handling Restrictions: n/a
Image Path:
ISecure: 1
Legacy Key: link1973/newtext/t19731065/abqcehuv.tel
Line Count: 167
Locator: TEXT ON-LINE
Office: ACTION SS
Original Classification: SECRET
Original Handling Restrictions: n/a
Original Previous Classification: n/a
Original Previous Handling Restrictions: n/a
Page Count: 4
Previous Channel Indicators:
Previous Classification: SECRET
Previous Handling Restrictions: n/a
Reference: n/a
Review Action: RELEASED, APPROVED
Review Authority: golinofr
Review Comment: n/a
Review Content Flags:
Review Date: 05 DEC 2001
Review Event:
Review Exemptions: n/a
Review History: WITHDRAWN <05-Oct-2001 by eisnerah, 3.4.X6, (NEGOT. SPECIFICS)>; RELEASED <05-Dec-2001 by golinofr>; APPROVED <05-Dec-2001 by golinofr>
Review Markings:

Declassified/Released
US Department of State
EO Systematic Review
30 JUN 2005

Review Media Identifier:
Review Referrals: n/a
Review Release Date: n/a
Review Release Event: n/a
Review Transfer Date:
Review Withdrawn Fields: n/a
Secure: OPEN
Status: NATIVE
Subject: SALT: HIGHLIGHTS OF OCT 5 POST-MEETING DISCUSSIONS (SALT TWO - 297)
TAGS: PARM
To: STATE INFO DOD
Type: TE
Markings: Declassified/Released US Department of State EO Systematic Review 30 JUN 2005